

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. Following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 10-11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fang (U.S. PGPUB 20040257369 A1) hereinafter referred as Fang.

3. As per claim 1, Fang discloses: A system, comprising:
a processor; a memory controller hub coupled to the processor; (Fang, Drawings, Figure 3, Block 300) a graphics controller coupled to the memory controller hub (Fang, Drawings, Figure 2, Blocks 175 and 180); a plurality of graphics frame buffers coupled to the graphics controller (Fang. Drawings, Figure 3, Block 133, and Figure 4 , Block 485, "The plurality of graphics processors has a plurality of buffers these buffers (Figure 1, block 150) are connected to the " Output controller (Figure 4, block, 475 and 485)""), wherein each graphics frame buffer corresponds to one of a plurality of players of a game application (Fang, Page 1, Paragraph[0006], lines 14-20);

a plurality of video frame buffers, the video frame buffer to receive input from a plurality of tuners (Fang, Drawings, Figure 4, blocks 475 and 450, “Figure 3, Block 200, this figure 3 shows a plurality of analog video decoders that receive analog video input in Figure 4 block 400. This step happened through a plurality of tuners”); a blending and display trait to receive input from the plurality of video frame buffers and the memory controller hub and (Fang, Figure 2, Block 230 and Figure 3 Block 320) ; and a plurality of video output units coupled to the blending and display unit (Fang, Figure 2, Block 180)

4. As per claim 10, Fang discloses: A method, comprising: Associating, by a graphics controller (Fang, Figure 4, Block 485), each of a plurality of graphics frame buffers (Fang, Page 3, Paragraph [0020] , lines 6 -9)with a corresponding one of a plurality of players of a game application (Fang, Page 1, Paragraph[0006], lines 14-20); storing images for the viewing perspective of each player in the associated graphics frame buffers (Fang, Page 2, Paragraph [0018] , lines 13 -16); and outputting the images associated with each player to a separate display (Fang, Page 1, Paragraph [0006], lines 17 - 20).

5. As per claim 11, Fan discloses: The method, further comprising blending graphics frames with video frames before outputting the images. (Fang, Page 1, Paragraph [0007], lines 1-3)

17. As per claim 17, Fang discloses : The system, wherein the graphics controller and the memory controller hub is one integrated device. (Fang, Drawings, Figure 2, Blocks 175 and 180);

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2 – 6 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang (U.S PG PUB 20040257369 A1) hereinafter referred as Fang in view of Grapes (U.S Patent 6446130 B1) hereinafter referred as Grapes.

8. As per claim 2, Fang discloses: The system of claim 1.

Fang doesn't disclose: the plurality of tuners to receive input from an RF cable.

However, Grapes discloses: the plurality of tuners to receive input from an RF cable (Grapes, Column 3, lines 33 - 39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that using an RF cable as taught by Grapes into the process of the Fang to provide an efficient transmission.

9. As per claim 3, Grapes discloses: The system, the plurality of video output units (Grapes, Figure 2, block 23) to each include an RF modulator.(Grapes, Figure 2, block 30)

10. As per claim 4, Grapes discloses: The system, each of the plurality of video output units to output a video display signal onto the RF cable. (Grapes, Column16, lines 3 -5).

11. As per claim 5, Grapes discloses: The system, wherein each of the plurality of video output units outputs a video display signal onto separate channels on the RF cable. (Grapes, column 6, lines 32 -38)

12. As per claim 6, Grapes discloses: The system, wherein the RF cable is coupled to a plurality of televisions. (Grapes, column 3, lines 20 - 28)

13. Argument used to reject claim 12 are the same as the arguments used to reject claim 2.

14. As per claim 13, Fang discloses: The method, wherein outputting the images associated with each player to a separate display includes outputting the images to a plurality of televisions. (Fang, Page 1, Paragraph [0003], lines 8-12)

15. As per claim 14, Fang discloses The method further comprising receiving game controller input (Fang, Page 2, Paragraph [0018], lines 1- 2), the game controller input causing modification of the viewing perspective (Fang, Page 2, Paragraph [0018], line 17) of at least one of the plurality of players. (Fang, Page 2, Paragraph [0018], lines 2 - 3)

16. Claims 7-9, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang (U.S PG PUB 20040257369 A1) hereinafter referred as Fang, in view of Grapes (U.S Patent 6446130 B1) hereinafter referred as Grapes, and further in view of Elliott (US PG PUB 20020077177 A1) hereinafter referred as Elliott.

17. As per claim 7, Fang in view of Grapes discloses: The system of claim 6.

Fang in view of Grapes doesn't disclose:

further comprising a plurality of game controllers couple to an input/output hub controller, the input/output hub controller coupled to the memory controller hub.

However, Elliott discloses: further comprising a plurality of game controllers(Elliott, Page 4, Paragraph [0056], lines 1 - 2) couple to an input/output hub controller (Elliott, Page 9, Paragraph [0101], lines 1- 8), the input/output hub controller coupled to the memory controller hub. (Elliott, Page 5, Paragraph [0071], lines 1 -15)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that connecting the game controllers to the graphics/memory controller hub as taught by Elliott into the process of the Fan in view of Grapes to provide an easy use of the game by the user.

18. As per claim 8, Elliott discloses: The system wherein at least one of the plurality of game controllers is coupled (Elliott, Paragraph [0056], lines 1-2)to the input/output controller hub (Elliott, Page 9, Paragraph [0101], lines 1- 8) via the RF cable (Elliott, Page 3, Paragraph [0049], lines 1- 4)

19. As per claim 9, Elliott discloses: The system , wherein at least one the plurality of game controllers is coupled (Elliott, Paragraph [0056], lines 1- 2) to the input/output controller hub (Elliott, Page 9, Paragraph [0101], lines 1- 8) via a wireless connection. (Elliott, Page 4, Paragraph [0056], lines 9 -12)

20. Argument used to reject claim 15 are the same as the arguments used to reject claim 9

21. Argument used to reject claim 16 are the same as the arguments used to reject claim 8

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments directed to claims 1-17 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

24. In response to applicants argument for claim 1, applicant argues that the prior art doesn't disclose a plurality of graphics frame buffers coupled to the graphics controller, wherein each graphics frame buffer corresponds to one of a plurality of players of a game application". This argument is not persuasive because Fang clearly stated that: (Fang.

Drawings, Figure 3, Block 133, and Figure 4 , Block 485, "The plurality of graphics processors has a plurality of buffers, these buffers (Figure 1, block 150) are connected to the “ Output controller (Figure 4, block, 475 and 485)””) and “Each channel can be either video, or graphics or a combination of the two. One integrated graphics card can drive multiple areas of interest on the same screen. Each display surface can have video as well as live or delayed information data such as stock, weather, sports, prices, specials or news which can overlay on the video, or be dedicated to a section of the screen”(see Fang, Page 1, Paragraph[0006], lines 14-20);

25. In response to applicants argument for claim 10; the same arguments use for claim 1, are used for claim 10.

26. In response to applicants argument for claim 2, applicant argues that the prior art doesn't disclose “the plurality of tuners to receive input from an RF cable”. This argument is not persuasive , because Grapes stated" transmit these signals to RF modulators, which combine the three signals into a single RF modulated signal suitable for reception by conventional television tuners “(see, Column 3, lines 33 - 39). The combination of Fang and Grapes introduce the limitation of claim 2.

27. In response to applicants argument for claims 7-9, applicant argues that the combination doesn't discloses: “ a plurality of graphics...”. This argument is not persuasive because Fang stated that: (Fang. Drawings, Figure 3, Block 133, and Figure 4 , Block 485, "The plurality of graphics processors has a plurality of buffers, these buffers (Figure 1, block 150) are connected to the “ Output controller (Figure 4, block, 475 and 485)””))

Conclusion

28. Applicants amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5254. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xiao Wu can be reached on (571) 272-7761. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Abderrahim Merouan/

Examiner, Art Unit 2628

/XIAO M. WU/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628